

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, and 6-8 are pending. By this response only, claims 1 and 6 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kushita, (US 6,570,689), Numata (JP 2002-280950) and Lilja (US 5,991,640); claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kushita, Numata, Lilja and Haruki (JP 2002-290606); Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kushita and Numata and Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kushita and Numata and Haruki. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 6 each recite *inter alia*, a first terminal provided with a first Bluetooth module... said first Bluetooth module is connected to a holder... a second terminal provided with a second Bluetooth... said holder having a detector to determine whether or not the first terminal is set to said holder and outputs to said second terminal a set signal when detecting that said first terminal is set to said holder ... and said second control unit of said second terminal automatically starts said Bluetooth module in response to the set signal sent thereto from the detector and establishes a wireless connection between said first terminal and said second terminal using said first and second Bluetooth module.

In the embodiment recited by claims 1 and 6, each of the first and second terminals each include Bluetooth modules. Both the first and second terminals check that the first terminal is connected to a holder. When the first terminal determines that it is connected to a holder it sends a signal to the second Bluetooth module of the second terminal. Both the first and second Bluetooth module are thus automatically started and a wireless connection between the two is established using Bluetooth.

The Examiner provides Kushita to teach these features. However, what Kushita teaches is a detection section 109 contained within the cradle (holder) which is

attached to automobile system 200 which the Examiner refers to as a second terminal. The detection section 109 of the cradle (holder) detects a portable phone (first terminal) when it is attached to the cradle. Thus, at best Kushita teaches the concept of detecting a connection when an object is placed on a cradle or holder by the cradle or holder itself and establishing a connection thereto.

What is absent in Kushita's teachings is the claimed features of connecting between a first and second terminal. Applicant's claims do refer to establishing a connection between a first terminal and a holder/cradle. Thus, Applicant agrees that Kushita teachings read on this part of the claim. But Kushita does not teach or suggest that a second terminal also determines whether the first terminal is connected to a holder/cradle and receiving a signal that the first terminal is connected to the holder and thus establishing a Bluetooth connection between the second terminal and the first terminal when this signal is received by the second terminal.

Further Numata and Lilja fail to remedy Kushita's deficiencies. Numata teaches the same thing as Kushita except instead of an infrared connection it uses a Bluetooth connection. Numata at paragraphs 24-26 discusses connecting a portable telephone 3 to a mounting base 25 (cradle/holder). When the portable telephone is placed in the holder a connection is established between the holder and the portable phone using Bluetooth. There is no teaching or suggestion of a second terminal determining whether a first terminal is connected to the mounting base and the mounting base sending a signal to the second terminal that connection is established with the first terminal. Further, an automatic connection between the first and second terminal using Bluetooth is not taught based on the detected connections.

Finally, Lilja is provided to teach a feature of charging when connected to a holder. However, Lilja fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kushita and Numata.

Thus, Kushita, Numata and Lilja fail to teach or suggest every single feature between claims 1-6 as noted above. Furthermore, Haruki is provided to teach features of dependent claim 7 and does not remedy any deficiencies of Kushita, Numata and

Lilja. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


For the at least the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3 and 6-8 are distinguished from the cited art. Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **June 30, 2009**

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Chad J. Billings  
Registration No.: 48, 917  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant